



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/917,126	07/27/2001	Ole Isacson	04843/080002	3321
21559	7590	10/06/2003	EXAMINER	
CLARK & ELBING LLP 101 FEDERAL STREET BOSTON, MA 02110			FALK, ANNE MARIE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1632	

DATE MAILED: 10/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/917,126

Applicant(s)

ISACSON ET AL.

Examiner

Anne-Marie Falk, Ph.D.

Art Unit

1632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2/02. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-18 are pending in the instant application.

Oath/Declaration

The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

The Post Office addresses are incomplete. The ZIP codes are not provided.

A mailing or post office address is an address at which an inventor customarily receives his or her mail and may be either a home or business address. The mailing or post office address should include the ZIP Code designation. The mailing or post office address may be provided in an application data sheet or a supplemental oath or declaration. See 37 CFR 1.63(c) and 37 CFR 1.76.

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See for example pages 25 and 28 of the specification. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-18 are rejected and Claims 12-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one

Art Unit: 1632

skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The claims are directed to a method of treating a human patient suffering from a neurodegenerative disease by engrafting into said patient a population of recombinant cells comprising one or more cell fate-inducing genes that permit said cells to form neurons in said patient. Although the preamble implies that the method will result in treatment of the disease, no particular treatment effect is achieved.

The specification fails to provide an enabling disclosure for the genetic modification of human ES cells. The recent literature addresses the difficulties encountered in attempting to transfect human ES cells. Zwaka et al. (2003) points out that there are significant differences between mouse and human ES cells and that “[h]igh, stable transfection efficiencies in human ES cells have been difficult to achieve, and, in particular, electroporation protocols established for mouse ES cells work poorly in human ES cells” (abstract). Thus, it is clear that the behavior of mouse ES cells is not predictive of human ES cells. In April 2001, Eiges et al. compared the efficiency of several different transfection protocols for human ES cells. The reference demonstrates use of the transfection protocol of ExGen 500 to transfect human ES cells. However, the instant specification teaches the use of adenovirus transduction for the genetic modification of human ES cells. Example 6 of the specification describes the transfection of human ES cells with an adenovirus carrying the β -galactosidase reporter gene. Although the disclosure states that “[s]taining for expression of the β -galactosidase marker gene was performed,” no results are provided with regard to the detection of β -galactosidase-expressing cells. Thus, at the time of filing, methods for successfully transfecting human ES cells were not known. The teachings of Eiges et al. (2001) would not have been available to the skilled artisan as of the filing date of this application which is July 27, 2000.

The specification fails to provide an enabling disclosure for the claimed method because the specification does not teach how to produce a therapeutic effect using the claimed method, particularly

over the full scope. The specification fails to teach an appropriate method for transferring a recombinant cell comprising a cell fate-inducing gene and expressing that gene at a level necessary to produce the desired therapeutic effect in a diseased animal, i.e. to produce replacement neurons at the critical locations. The specification fails to provide an enabling disclosure for the use of the claimed method in gene therapy applications because the specification does not offer adequate guidance in this regard and because methods of gene therapy are not routinely successful. Therefore, the disclosure must teach how to use the claimed method with specific guidance. However, the specification does not provide adequate guidance as to the use of the claimed method to treat a diseased animal. The specification does not teach the level of gene expression required, the number of transduced cells needed, when or for how long the gene should be expressed, or the frequency of administration of the transfected neuronal precursor cells required, for treatment of any pathological condition. At the time the application was filed, the art of administering any type of genetic expression vector, including transfected cells, to an individual so as to provide a tangible therapeutic benefit was poorly developed and unpredictable. The NIH ad hoc committee to assess the current status and promise of gene therapy reported in December 1995 that "clinical efficacy has not been definitively demonstrated at this time in any gene therapy protocol, despite anecdotal claims..." and that "significant problems remain in all basic aspects of gene therapy" (Orkin and Motulsky, p. 1). In a review article published in Scientific American in June 1997, Theodore Friedmann discusses the technical barriers which have so far prevented successful gene therapy, and states "So far, however, no approach has definitively improved the health of a single one of the more than 2,000 patients who have enrolled in gene therapy trials worldwide" (p. 96). In a review article published in Nature in September 1997, Inder Verma states "Although more than 200 clinical trials are currently underway worldwide, with hundreds of patients enrolled, there is still no single outcome that we can point to as a success story" (p. 239). The instant specification does not adequately teach one skilled in the art how to use the claimed method of *ex vivo* gene therapy. Thus, absent any showing that the claimed

method can be used in gene therapy applications to produce the intended therapeutic effect, the claims directed to methods for gene therapy are not enabled by the disclosure.

The specification fails to provide an enabling disclosure for the method of transplantation because methods of transplantation of neural tissue are not routinely successful and the specification does not offer adequate guidance to enable one skilled in the art to practice the claimed invention to derive a therapeutic benefit in a diseased animal. The specification teaches that the only use for the claimed method of transplantation is to produce a therapeutic effect but the specification does not adequately teach how to use the claimed method to produce such an effect. Jackowski et al. (1995) details the limitations and unpredictability associated with the transplantation of neural tissue. The specification does not offer specific guidance as to how this method could be used therapeutically for the wide variety of disorders contemplated. No working examples demonstrate a therapeutic effect for the claimed method of transplantation. The specification fails to provide any guidance relating to the number of cells to inject, the site of injection, and the extent of cellular persistence required and attainable in practice, to provide any therapeutic benefit for any disorder.

The specification contemplates that transfecting the ES cells with one transcription factor gene or the right combination of several transcription factor genes will be sufficient to direct the cells to differentiate *in vivo* into the appropriate cell type and functionally integrate into the tissue into which they are implanted. However, the state of the art for *in vivo* differentiation of ES cells is undeveloped. While much work has been done to develop techniques for the directed differentiation of ES cells *in vitro* to produce desired cell types, little is known about the behavior of these cells *in vivo* or how they will interact with the local environment when implanted into adult tissues. Jackowski (1995) details the limitations and unpredictability associated with the transplantation of neural tissue.

Given the lack of applicable working examples, the limited guidance provided in the specification, the broad scope of the claims with regard to the wide variety of diseases covered and the wide variety of stem cell types that could be used, and the unpredictability for achieving a therapeutic

Art Unit: 1632

effect upon the transplantation of human ES cells, undue experimentation would have been required for one skilled in the art to practice the claimed method of the invention in a human patient for therapeutic benefit.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-11, 17, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-11, 17, and 18 are indefinite in their recitation of "cell fate-inducing genes" because this term is not defined in the specification. Thus, the metes and bounds of the claims are not clearly set forth.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,284,539 (Bowen et al., filed October 9, 1998).

The claims are directed to a method of treating a human patient suffering from a neurodegenerative disease by engrafting into said patient a population of recombinant cells comprising one or more cell fate-inducing genes that permit said cells to form neurons in said patient. Although the

Art Unit: 1632

preamble implies that the method will result in treatment of the disease, no particular treatment effect is achieved.

Bowen et al. discloses introducing the gene encoding Nurr-1 into central nervous system stem cells to cause the cells to adopt a dopaminergic fate. The reference further teaches that this technology can be used to prepare dopaminergic cells for transplantation in Parkinson's Disease or other neurological disorders (see abstract).

Thus, the claimed invention is disclosed in the prior art.

Conclusion

No claims are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anne-Marie Falk whose telephone number is (703) 306-9155. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday and alternate Fridays from 10:00 AM to 7:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah Reynolds, can be reached on (703) 305-4051. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the patent analyst, William Phillips, whose telephone number is (703) 305-3482.

Anne-Marie Falk, Ph.D.

Anne-Marie Falk
ANNE-MARIE FALK, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER